



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,459	03/31/2004	Diane L. Peterson	21910.NP	6397
20551	7590	06/20/2006	EXAMINER	
THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP. 8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200 SANDY, UT 84070			SILBERMANN, JOANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3611	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,459	PETERSON, DIANE L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joanne Silbermann	3611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 and 24-44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 10-23 in the reply filed on April 3, 2006 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-9 and 24-44 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 3, 2006.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the third coin layer and the precious or semi-precious stones (claim 15), a bezel (claim 20), and a crystal or glass layer (claim 21) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

Art Unit: 3611

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 10-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. In claims 10, 12 and 13, use of the term "less" is considered to be indefinite. Such a term is relative and does not accurately describe the type of material being used. Additionally, "less expensive" relies completely on the price of the material, and may not be constant. Also "less precious" is not definite since some materials may be precious to some people but not others.

7. In claim 22 it is not clear if the engraved image is the same as the image in claim 10, or if a second image is being claimed.

Art Unit: 3611

8. The remaining claims are rejected as depending from a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 10-14 and 16-23, as far as definite, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard, US \$3,983,646 in view of Benderly, US #6,422,037.

11. Howard teaches a coin having first and second metallic layers 12, 13, secured with adhesive (column 2 lines 39). The layers may include indicia (column 3 lines 34-35). Howard does not teach engraved indicia.

12. Benderly teaches a coin having a metal substrate with engraved indicia thereon (see Abstract). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize engraved indicia on the coin so as to provide an image that will not be easily or inadvertently removed.

13. Benderly also teaches using gold or other precious metals as well as less precious metals. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize gold or any other well known precious material to produce a coin of a desired value. Also, it would have been obvious to choose any well known material since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the

Art Unit: 3611

basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

14. Benderly also teaches bezel 11 and glass layer 19 (Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to utilize such a bezel and glass layer in the device of Howard so as to provide protection for the coin, as is taught by Benderly.

15. Howard describes the coin as being spendable at a particular location (see Background) and the image is considered to be memorabilia.

16. Howard and Benderly do not specifically teach the image as being a serial number or as representing an event from history. This however, is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to place any decorative or informative indicia on the coin so that a user would know its value, or may keep it as a memento (such as state issued quarters). Also, patentable novelty cannot be principally predicated on mere printed matter and arrangements thereof, but must reside basically in physical structure. *In re Montgomery*, 102 USPQ 248 (CCPA 1954).

17. Regarding claim 17, Howard teaches using a plurality of coins (column 3 lines 54-63).

18. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard and Benderly as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Chan, US #6,948,999.

19. Howard teaches third coin layer 11c as shown in Figure 1c. Howard and Benderly, as discussed above do not teach the use of precious stones, however this is well known in the art. Chan teaches the idea of placing jewels around a display. It

Art Unit: 3611


would have been obvious to utilize precious or semi-precious stones around the display so as to create a more attractive, decorative coin.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joanne Silbermann whose telephone number is 571-272-6653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Joanne Silbermann
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3611

js
14 June 2006